

**REPORT FOR: TRAFFIC AND ROAD
SAFETY ADVISORY
PANEL**

Date of Meeting: 8 February 2012

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**
Petitions relating to:

1. Honeypot Lane & Winchester Road – Traffic Safety Proposals (three petitions)
2. Kingshill Avenue Area – Proposed yellow line waiting restrictions
3. Buckingham Road, Edgware- request to resolve parking problems
4. Shaftesbury Circle – Opposing proposed waiting restrictions
5. Argyle Road, North Harrow
Objection to parking bays
6. Fallowfield, Stanmore- Objection to proposed waiting restrictions
7. Nelson Road, West Street and adjacent terraces - Objection to proposed waiting restrictions

Responsible Officer: Brendon Hills - Corporate Director
Community and Environment

Exempt: No

Enclosures: Appendix A – Winchester Road
petitioners proposed diagram of one
way working
Appendix B – Winchester Road
petitioners proposal

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last meeting of TARSAP and provides details of the Council's investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Honeypot Lane & Winchester Road – Traffic Safety Proposals

2.1 The first petition contained 27 signatures from residents of Winchester Road between numbers 13 and 83. The petition states:

“Regarding the proposed access closure on the service road outside 219-223 Honeypot Lane, we the residents object for the following reasons:

- *For residents of Malvern Gardens and Winchester Road – A single point for both entry and exit between Honeypot Lane and the service road creates a gridlock on the service road during peak times. It also causes a queue of traffic waiting to turn right into the service road from Honeypot Lane*
- *Parked cars on the service road still only leave only one lane for all two-way traffic entering and leaving Malvern Gardens and Winchester Road*
- *Regardless of the bus lane timings, turning right from the service road onto Honeypot Lane at the central access point is still a problem, especially when there are cars on Honeypot Lane waiting to turn right into the service road*

An alternative, more viable (and also cost effective) option to solve the issue of the service road being used as a rat-run at dangerous speeds and for short cuts would be:

- *To make the access outside no's. 219-223 a no-entry from Honeypot Lane, while still allowing exit from the service road onto Honeypot Lane.*
- *To create a one-way system on the service road, as per the diagram below:" (See Appendix A)*

2.2 The second petition was presented to the council by a group of local residents from Malvern Gardens. The petition contained 44 signatures from between numbers 83 and 158. The second petition states:

"With reference to the recent plans from Harrow Council, I would like to bring to your attention the following points:

- *Having the bus lane from 7am to 7pm will make turning in at the middle of the service road dangerous because if you are traveling up from Kingsbury, you will have to cross the bus lane.*
- *Also, if you are in the traffic coming from Queensbury roundabout to turn into the service round, you can wait five minutes before you get across.*
- *All the traffic that comes off of Honeypot Lane now comes down Malvern Gardens and a lot of the times at high speed, we need to slow the traffic down to 20mph limit and to have speed humps.*
- *We also need to address the commuter parking from Queensbury rail station by having restricted permit parking eg 10am to 11am to stop the volume of parked cars.*

Winchester Road has also asked for parking permits for residents only.

You many not realise it but if the Council implements the changes in their recent mail shot, all the commuter parking will be in Malvern Gardens which will add more problems to the ones we already have."

2.3 The third petition was presented to the council (via a local ward councillor) by a group of local residents on Winchester Road. The petition contained signatures from 41 properties of Winchester Road. The petition states:

"The residents of Winchester Road have carried out a petition for the current issues with parking and width of road for large vehicles such as emergency services, deliveries and refuse collection.

Firstly, the proposal which have been dent door to door about the 2 week trial of the road closure onto the service road is not acceptable by any residents. Having one entry feeding 3 residential roads is not acceptable) two roads are feeding schools). This has caused a lot more inconvenience getting in and out of the service road.

We have got a proposal done by a qualified traffic Management expert, which has considered all the advantages and disadvantages for the residents of Winchester Road. (See Appendix B)

There have been at least 3 - 4 attempts made in order to meet door to door with residents to discuss the issues with the petition sheet. After speaking to most of the residents, we have come to the conclusion that the double and single yellow line proposals are not acceptable. This will reduce the parking spaces available on the entire road. The petition is self-explanatory and has achieved the most votes in favour of it.

Our petition attached highlights some important facts which are required by the residents on Winchester Road.

- 1. No parking on the entire road between 10am and 11am on the entire road. Residents can park their vehicles on the road with a free of charge resident's permit. This will stop commuters of Queensbury station parking on our road.*
- 2. Create parking bays partially on the road and partially on the pavement. This will give maximum parking spaces available, increase road width and ease of driving in and out of the driveways and access for large vehicles*
- 3. Safe pedestrian crossing on Honeypot Lane required where located in the drawing, not the location proposed by the council.*
- 4. Move the start point of the bus lane for ease of getting in and out of the service road.*
- 5. Keep two way flows in and out of the service road*
- 6. Keep the current bus lane timing on Honeypot Lane*

Results of our Petition:

- 80 properties on Winchester Road*
- 41 in favour of the proposed petition (signed by them)*
- 16 not agree with the proposal*
- 23 not contactable after 4 visits. (Old pensioners do not open doors to strangers and other reasons)*

Results in percentage:

- 57 households took part in the petition*
- 76.63% agree with the petition of the proposed design*
- 23.37% do not agree with the petition*

- 2.4 A meeting was convened with the Portfolio Holder on 13th December 2011 to discuss the results of the public consultation, the trial closure of the service road near Winchester Road and the three petitions.
- 2.5 It was clear from on site observations at different times of the day that the temporary road closure of the service road caused severe congestion mainly at peak times in the morning and afternoon and therefore it was decided not to proceed with making this a permanent road closure.
- 2.6 The results of consultation regarding the waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in Winchester Road were mixed with 18 (25%) in support 17 (23%) opposed and 38 (52%) with no strong opinion either way.

There were concerns however regarding displacement of parking into surrounding roads if the Winchester Road proposal was adopted. It was therefore agreed not to proceed at this stage with the double yellow lines in Winchester Road.

- 2.7 It was further agreed that the situation regarding the parking in the area and the suggestions put forward by local residents will be reported to the February TARSAP meeting.
- 2.8 With regard to the bus lane hours it was agreed to leave these as they are (Mon - Fri 7-10am 4 - 7pm) but to shorten the bus lane by about 80 metres to allow the construction of a new pedestrian refuge which would give pedestrians more opportunities to cross Honeypot Lane.

Kingshill Avenue Area – Proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions

- 2.9 A petition was received on 6th December 2011 which contains 49 signatures from residents in Kingshill Avenue. The petition states:

“Further to my letter to you dated 2nd December 2011, please find attached a signed petition from residents of Kingshill Avenue who are opposing the proposed double yellow lines at junctions.

The second attachment sheet shows the break-down of residents’ opinion by house number. Out of the 127 houses, I managed to get an answer from 75 residents, nearly 70% of whom object (some very strongly) against the introduction of double yellow lines at junctions on their road. They share the same sentiments as those outlined in my previous letter to you.

Most of the residents I spoke to were actually unaware of the council’s proposal as they had not seen the notices attached on street posts, (as it is winter most do not venture out on foot much). They were waiting to hear from the council by direct mail, myself included hence the last minute correspondence!

Residents most in favour of your proposal are ones living near the junction with Brampton Road as this is a blind corner and they have observed that cars travel very fast around this junction.

Many residents also commented that instead of having double yellow lines at ALL the junctions, they would like to see alternatives such as:

- *An earlier right access towards Kenton Lane (if coming from Kingsbury). Most of us feel that as there is no earlier right turning before our road, this brings a lot of unnecessary passing traffic onto St. Leonards Avenue/Kingshill Avenue.*
- *Some form of deterrence from cars travelling too fast at the Brampton Road junction plus something to improve the current ‘blind spot’ would be welcome.*

- *Many would prefer that the council spend the money on improving the condition of their road and especially the pavement as this is in a very bad state and repairs are long overdue.*

I shall be seeing Mr. Maru, one of the portfolio holders on Tuesday, 6th December to discuss the residents' concerns.

I would urge the council to seriously consider the comments made by residents of Kingshill Avenue and the contents of my previous letter before arriving at any decision."

- 2.10 A meeting with the Portfolio Holder of Environment and Community Safety was subsequently held on 13th December to discuss the outcome of the public and statutory consultation and to consider the contents of the petition.
- 2.11 Following those discussions, the Portfolio Holder had no concerns regarding the waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposals and agreed to these proceeding on safety grounds. All the issues raised are non contentious and the decision has been made to over rule the above objection.

Buckingham Road, Edgware - Request for action on parking problems

- 2.12 A petition has been received which contains 26 signatures from residents of Buckingham Road. The petition states:
- "We the undersigned request that action is taken by the Highways Department to control and resolve the problems currently being experienced by residents in the Buckingham Road area due to commuter parking, which is causing severe traffic flow, resident access and resident parking problems within this area"*
- 2.13 The parking and associated traffic problems in Buckingham Road are well known and the area has been on the parking review programme for some time. The Panel in February 2011 agreed that a review of the area around Canons Park Station would commence in 2011.
- 2.14 A stakeholders meeting was held in July 2011 and public consultation was carried out in December 2011 to ascertain local residents and businesses views on a number of options.
- 2.15 The results of public consultation and the views received from Buckingham Road are included in a separate decision report to this Panel meeting.
- 2.16 The petition has been acknowledged and all signatories informed that the petition would be reported to this Panel along with a report on the public consultation outcome.

- 2.17 The petitioners will be informed on the Panels recommendations for parking controls to be progressed to statutory consultation together with any views of the Panel.

Shaftesbury Circle – opposing proposed waiting restrictions

- 2.18 A petition has been received which contains 9 signatures from residents of No 11 to 27 Shaftesbury Circle. The petition was in response to local consultation on local safety scheme proposals including waiting restrictions on Shaftesbury Circle. The petition states:

“ we (all the residents of No. 11 to 27 Shaftesbury Circle) jointly oppose your proposed double yellow line waiting restriction in front of our block of flats marked”

- 2.19 The petition goes on to draw comparisons between the service road in front of No 11 to 27 Shaftesbury Circle and two similar quadrants of Shaftesbury Circle which have less extensive double yellow lines proposed.
- 2.20 An almost identical point of view had previously been raised by the local neighbourhood champion who was also responding to the same consultation.
- 2.21 After careful consideration of the content of the petition there are insufficient safety reasons to justify these more extensive restrictions against the loss of parking amenity for this particular group of residents.
- 2.22 It is arguable that similar restrictions to that originally proposed should be proposed in the other two similar quadrants as the carriageway widths of the service roads are only marginally over 6 metres with parking currently occurring on both sides. Any such proposal would however be for a future review of parking controls in the area.
- 2.23 At this stage it is therefore proposed to advertise the reduced restrictions as part of statutory consultation of the scheme proposals. The petitioners have been advised of these revised proposals.

Argyle Road, North Harrow - objection to parking bays

- 2.24 A petition as received on 24th November 2011 containing 16 signatures from residents of Argyle Road. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, residents of Argyle Road, having seen the proposals hereby object to the draft traffic order as set out in the letter from the Parking and Sustainable Transport dated Thursday 17th November 2011”.

- 2.25 The background is that funding was obtained from the Greater London Authority (GLA), as part of the outer London fund round 1, to provide additional on street parking in North Harrow. This followed requests from the traders association and the council's priority to help local businesses.

2.26 The proposals included:

- Station Road Inset Pay & Display Parking Bay outside Police Station
- Station Road - Modification of loading bays southwest of the Station entrance to provide loading facilities and pay & display parking
- Argyle Road – provision of parking bays
- Cambridge Road - provision of parking/disabled bays
- Northumberland Road - provision of parking bays

2.27 Details of the proposals can be seen in **Appendix C**

2.28 Local consultation took place in September/October and the results were discussed with ward councillors from Headstone North and West Harrow. A number of comments and objections were received and were presented to ward councillors. The main focus of objections centred on the removal of the central islands, constructed around 20 years ago, necessary to implement the parking bays. The consensus from ward councillors was that the proposals at Northumberland and Cambridge Road should be abandoned and the remaining elements progressed to implementation.

2.29 A subsequent meeting was held with the Portfolio Holders for Environment and Community Safety and Planning Development and Enterprise and it was agreed to pursue to implementation the recommendations of the ward councillors.

2.30 The consultees were informed of the outcome in a letter dated 17th November which is the document that is referred to in the petition. It was explained that a separate statutory consultation process involving the advertising of a draft traffic order for the parking control alterations ie yellow lines, pay and display charges. No statutory process was necessary to remove the central island in Argyle Road or mark out the parking bays.

2.31 At the time of receipt of the petition no actual draft traffic order had been advertised and so the lead petitioner was informed of this fact and was asked to clarify what the intention of the petition was. They were informed that the draft traffic order was intended to be published on 1st December and that there would be a 21 day period when people could comment or object to the traffic order.

2.32 No response was received from the lead petitioner and since then the draft traffic orders have been advertised and no objections were received. The bays in Argyle Road were implemented in December and the remaining works programmed to start in early January. It is likely that the pay & display controls and other parking restriction changes will come into effect at the beginning of March 2012.

- 2.33 The panel is asked to note the petition and the circumstances surrounding its receipt.

Fallowfield, Stanmore – objection to waiting restrictions proposed as part of the Local Safety Parking Programme.

- 2.34 A petition has been received which contains 28 signatures from residents of Fallowfield. These residents live at 22 separate addresses. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, all being residents of Fallowfield, Stanmore, strongly OBJECT to harrow Council’s proposals for double yellow lines in the road.”

It questions the basis for the proposals and finally states:

“We would only like to see the double yellow lines extended at the very top of the road (the entrance/exit) as the road is indeed very narrow there. ...”

- 2.35 The contents of this petition along with other objections and representations made regarding the proposed restrictions in Fallowfield will be analysed and discussed with the Portfolio Holder as part of the consideration of objections.

Nelson Road, West Street and adjacent terraces - Objection to proposed waiting restrictions.

- 2.36 A petition has been received which contains 126 signatures from 101 addresses who are residents of Nelson Road/Trafalgar Terrace, the western section of West Street/Victoria and Wellington Terraces. The petition states:

“We the unsigned Residents/Occupiers of ..., are writing to object to the Proposed Parking programme outlined in the above notice for the following reasons:-“

It goes on to provide 7 reasons which are summarised below:

- *Disproportionate double yellow line proposals leading to loss of parking space which is in short supply. Parking pressures for the limited space by commuters parking on street*
- *No alternative parking is being provided*
- *High car ownership from residents*
- *No significant problem with emergency or larger vehicle access*
- *The Monday morning waiting restriction for refuse collection access would matters worse for a problem which is not particularly significant*
- *Refuse is collected often takes place early or away from peak periods*
- *A smaller refuse vehicle is used for Nelson Road to overcome problems*

It concludes “*We feel the price being asked from Residents/Occupiers in terms of lost parking spaces ..., is a step too far and the Proposals will result in no tangible benefits, only additional problems, with no solution.*”

- 2.37 The contents of this petition along with other objections and representations made regarding the proposed restrictions for the Harrow on the Hill area will be analysed and discussed with the Portfolio Holder as part of the consideration of objections.

Localised Safety Parking Programme on Harrow on the Hill

- 2.38 Report to follow

Section 3 – Further Information

- 3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting. No updates will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

Section 4 – Financial Implications

- 4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report require further investigation and would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

Section 5 – Corporate Priorities

- 5.1. Any suggested measures in the report accord with our corporate priorities:
- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
 - United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
 - Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
 - Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

Section 6 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani



on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 19/01/12

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Barry Philips, Team Leader - Traffic and Road Safety

Tel: 020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Paul Newman - Team Leader - Parking and Sustainable Transport

Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622,

E -mail: paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports and Public Consultation Documents